

Town Meeting



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

GEORGE D. AIKEN

HENRY CABOT LODGE

ALEXANDER WILEY

HUGH A. MEADE

(See also page 14)

COMING

—March 2, 1948—

What's Wrong With the Comics?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.





CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF FEBRUARY 24:

"Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Senator AIKEN	5
Congressman MEADE	7
Senator WILEY	9
Senator LODGE	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	14
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	18

• THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 2:

"What's Wrong With the Comics?"

The Broadcast of February 24, 1948, originated in Waterbury, Connecticut, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST, under the auspices of the Second Church Forum of the Second Congregational Church, and over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



FEBRUARY 24, 1948

VOLUME 13, No. 44

Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?

Announcer:

Tonight marks the 497th broadcast of America's Town Meeting of the Air which means that on March 16 we will celebrate our 500th broadcast of this series which has become a national institution.

It was on May 30, 1935, that this famous series started with a discussion of the subject "Which Way America — Fascism, Communism, Socialism, or Democracy?" On March 16, we repeat that program with two of the original speakers — Raymond Moley and Norman Thomas. The other two speakers, appraising the threats of fascism and communism, respectively, will be Dr. Leon Birkhead, president of the Friends of Democracy, and Martin Ebon, author of *World Communism Today*.

As most of you know, for the first six years, Town Meeting was broadcast only half a year every season, but by popular demand

Town Meeting went on a year round basis in May, 1942, and has continued on a year round basis ever since.

Now to preside over our discussion here is our moderator, the president of Town Hall and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr., Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Before we begin tonight's discussion, let me read a wire I sent last night on your behalf to the four avowed candidates for the Republican presidential nomination, Senator Taft, Governor Dewey, Governor Stassen, and Governor Warren:

"Since the presidential elections of 1936, Town Meeting has regularly invited the candidates of the two major parties to debate major issues of the election over this network. As the only avowed can-

didates for the Republican nomination this year, we've invited you individually, and some of you in pairs, to discuss the issues of this campaign. We now repeat this invitation publicly, as we believe it is important that the public hear and understand the position of each candidate for the highest office in the land. We do not believe that this can be accomplished by individual, unrelated speeches to party groups. The American people are turning once again to their traditional Town Meeting method of discussing public questions, where all sides are presented at the same meeting at the same time.

We, therefore, urge you on behalf of our vast Town Meeting audience, which has been built up over a period of 13 years, to accept our invitation to participate in one or more Town Meetings on a mutually agreeable date or dates, any Tuesday night between now and the date of the Republican Convention.

When the nominee of your party is selected, he and the nominee of the Democratic Party will be extended similar invitations. We urge your acceptance in the interest of a thoroughly informed public opinion." (*Applause.*)

For many reasons this is an appropriate place to discuss tonight's question. Waterbury, Connecticut, is a typical New England industrial city on the banks of the Naugatuck River, the brass center

of the world, and the home of many well-known watch companies.

New England is also the home of the Town Meeting idea, where men and women are accustomed to meeting together to discuss their common problems. A modern adaptation of the early New England Town Meeting is the Second Congregational Church Forum which meets here every Sunday evening under the leadership of the Reverend John C. Walker, our host this evening.

Tonight's problem involves the entire Nation. "Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?" The plan for a St. Lawrence Seaway has been before Congress for the past 30 years, and the present one, advocated by Senator Aiken of Vermont and Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, is to be voted on by the United States Senate on Friday of this week.

Briefly put, the project calls for deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence River, the St. Clair River, and the Detroit River, and altering the docks at Sault Ste. Marie to enable ocean-going vessels to reach 2,000 miles into the heart of America converting cities like Chicago, Duluth, Superior and Detroit into world seaports.

The plan also involves the construction of a giant dam and hydroelectric plant, with a potential output of 2,200,000 horsepower. The total cost has been

estimated in the neighborhood of \$720,000,000.

Senator Lodge of Massachusetts and Congressman Meade of Maryland challenge the proponents of this plan on the grounds of its cost, alleged benefits, and constitutionality. The St. Lawrence Seaway represents one of the most extensively debated public questions of the current century, and tonight your Town Meeting is proud to bring to you at the climax of this controversy such distinguished representatives of the American people from the Congress of the United States to debate this issue.

We hear first from the Republican Senator from the State of Vermont, the Governor of his state from 1937-1939 and elected to the United States Senate in November, 1940, the Honorable George D. Aiken of Vermont. Senator Aiken. (*Applause.*)

Senator Aiken:

I am glad of this opportunity to discuss with Senators Wiley and Lodge and Congressman Meade the question of the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. This great development would harness the greatest natural resources in North America. It would make it possible to load ships with grains, steel, beef, or automobiles, at the ports of Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, or Buffalo, and deliver those cargoes to any part of the world for what it now costs to transship

the same goods by rail from Buffalo or Cleveland to New York or Baltimore.

This would enable our midwest industries to meet competition from any part of the world, in any part of the world.

It will enable the farmers of the Great Plains states to ship their wheat and other grains competitively to Europe, South America, or Asia, at a saving of approximately 10 cents a bushel over what it now costs.

It will enable the Eastern Seaboard to receive food products from the Midwest and to reship manufactured goods to the Great Lakes states by an all-water route.

It will enable the lumber manufacturers of the Pacific Northwest to ship by water directly to Milwaukee, Toledo, Rochester, or any other Great Lakes port.

In fact, it would go far in relieving the present shortage of transportation which exists in America today.

The water flowing over the great dam, which it is proposed to build across the St. Lawrence at Massena, New York, would generate over two million horsepower of electrical energy. This amount of energy is the equivalent of that generated by 41 million barrels of oil each year.

The power thus generated would do much to relieve the extreme shortage of electrical energy which now exists throughout northeastern United States and southern

Canada. This power shortage is becoming more acute year by year. The private power companies cannot construct steam plants fast enough to keep up with the growing demand.

Ever since last summer, industrial plants in Northern New England and New York have had to curtail their operations. Farmers have been handicapped for power to operate milking machines and other farm equipment. One REA with over 2,000 members, nearly all farmers, was pre-emptorily ordered by the private power company to get its power elsewhere and had to resort to inefficient Diesel engines for its supply.

Chemicals, mining, and metal companies have had to curtail production, and just before this broadcast I received word that the Aluminum Company at Massena, New York, at the very site of this proposed dam will lay off 110 more men March 1 because of a power shortage.

On V-J Day our Nation was using power at the rate of 240 billion kilowatt hours annually. Today we are using power at the rate of 300 billion kilowatt hours annually, an increase of 25 per cent in two years.

We have become an electrified Nation. We must have more power. The St. Lawrence development would provide the greatest single bloc of undeveloped power in all North America and at the

lowest cost. To let this 2,200,000 horsepower rush down the St. Lawrence River day and night unharnessed is a flagrant waste of energy which we can no longer tolerate.

The development of the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence Waterway is of vital importance to our neighboring nation of Canada. Canada too must have increased transportation and power facilities if she is to grow and prosper. We must have a strong, self-reliant nation to the north of us in order to enhance our own national security. We hope and pray there may be no more war, but we know that if there is, a strong Canada will be a mighty bulwark of our defenses.

While the St. Lawrence Seaway will be of great importance to the entire Nation, it will be of particular benefit to New York and New England where we now pay the highest electrical rates of any part of the United States.

Only the monopolistic, special interests are now opposed to the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway. None of the arguments they raise against the development are valid. They are prompted wholly by a blind self-interest. It is time that Congress approve this development without any further delay. Let us not retard the growth and security of our Nation in order to appease a few. (A pause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Aiken. Our next speaker was born in New Jersey but moved to Baltimore at an early age, graduated from Loyola College and the University of Maryland Law School and started his political career as secretary to the late Governor Albert C. Richie of Maryland. He served in the United States Navy in World War II and was elected to the 80th Congress in November, 1946. Town Meeting is happy to welcome Congressman Hugh A. Meade of Maryland. Congressman Meade. (*Applause.*)

Congressman Meade:

Mr. Denny and friends. In spite of Senator Aiken's delightful presentation, my answer to this question is categorically "No." The passage of this legislation in the form in which it is now before Congress would be unwise, unsound, and unconstitutional.

Let's take a look at the unconstitutional part first. Here is a project of tremendous magnitude taking five or six years to build, imposing obligations upon our Government for years to come. It gives partial control to our Government over the territory of another country. If there was ever a piece of legislation calling for a treaty, this is it.

But what does the proposed legislation seek to do? It proposes, through the medium of a mere executive agreement—that is,

the approval of the President and the majority of each branch of Congress—to bind the United States in a program lasting for years to come and costing no one knows how many hundreds of millions or billions of dollars. And mind you, this is a program which any succeeding Congress can repeal or Canada can repeal.

A treaty is not in this status. A treaty is morally and legally binding on the Government and cannot be revoked except within the terms which the treaty itself provides. If this type of legislation—an executive agreement—should pass, we would just be taking one more step in the direction of having Congress abrogate its powers and turn over to the Executive Department, the whole responsibility of carrying on the foreign relations of this Government.

Now, why do I say this proposed scheme is unwise and unsound. Here is a proposition, the actual cost of which no one knows. Prominent international engineers, skilled in such projects, have estimated the cost at over one billion dollars. Imagine us, you Mr. and Mrs. America, with a national debt of 257 billion dollars, deciding to take on another billion dollar boondoggling experiment.

Why, in common sense and good judgment, shouldn't we try to pay off some of our debts before we start an unnecessary program of expansion which is going to add to our debt instead of re-

ducing it? It just doesn't make sense to me.

Now, what is this proposed billion dollar program going to do? Why, it's going to build a navigable waterway for 1,300 miles from Montreal to Duluth. It's going to provide a seaway, 27 feet in depth, 450 feet wide with 67 miles of canals and 18 locks. Who is going to pay for it? Why you, Mr. Railroad Worker, and you, Mr. Trucker, Mr. Stevedore, Mr. Pilot, Mr. Tugboat Operator. You, all of you, and any of you who live in any of the eastern or gulf ports are going to be taxed your share of this billion dollar or so project to put yourselves out of a job.

Oh, of course, you'll be told that this is a self-liquidating project, but no one, not even the most ardent supporter of the program really believes that. You are going to be taxed to support, in the name of national defense, a fantastic scheme, which one single bomb, one sabotaged lock, one sunken ship, could put out of order in nothing flat.

But, they'll tell you, aside from national defense—and the best authorities admit that this isn't vital and can't be defended—think how cheaply the products from the Midwest can be carried all over the world, with every Great Lakes port a seaport.

Senators Aiken and Wiley don't tell you that the St. Lawrence has more crooks and turns than a snake. They don't tell you about

high, prohibitive insurance rates for cargoes carried through 6 miles of canals and 18 locks. They don't tell you that the proposed legislation calls for only a 27-foot canal, and that 90 per cent of our American ships couldn't be used in a canal of that draft.

And, incidentally, if they want to make it deeper, they'd better revise their figures and make the cost $1\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 billion dollars. They don't tell you that ocean ships are not designed for operation on calm waters, with swift currents in narrow channels, at low rates of speed.

They don't tell you there isn't a dock or port facility now in the St. Lawrence large enough to take care of the traffic they propose.

They don't tell you that the St. Lawrence Seaway would be open only seven months of the year, and would be closed five months because of ice. As a matter of fact, they don't tell you the whole scheme is to construct a power project and charge off most of the cost to the Seaway.

To sum it all up, here is a power scheme trying to pass itself off in the guise of a national defense project. It is probably unconstitutional; it would represent a national defense; it would cost a fortune to create and maintain and the people of all the coastal cities, who would be asked to pay for it, would be taxing themselves out of their own jobs. I am against it. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Congressman Meade. Well, we see there are two sides to this issue. Now there are two more Senators down in Washington, who are waiting to give us their points of view. May we hear now from the senior United States Senator from Wisconsin, who is Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, was first elected to the Senate in 1939 and again in 1944, when the Nation was voting overwhelmingly against his party, Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican, speaking to us from Washington. (*Applause.*)

Senator Wiley:

Mr. Denny, and friends of the America Town Meeting of the Air. A wise Scotchman once said, "There isn't any problem you and I can't handle, Lord." Our problem in America, my friends, is to overcome the inspired fear of the selfish interests that would block this great development. The fear of certain business groups on the Atlantic and Gulf ports, and the fear of the eastern railroads.

President Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The arguments that you've listened to so far were all repeated when the Panama Canal was up.

The plan for the St. Lawrence River Seaway calls for opening up the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence—a distance of

119 miles. From the great port of Duluth-Superior in the heart of the continent to the Gulf of St. Lawrence there are 2,347 miles and goods can be transported now through shallow draft ships—and they are transported over a 14-foot channel. With the exception of this 119 miles the waterway is already completed and functioning.

What is proposed, my friends, under the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan is merely the removal of the obstructions from these short 119 miles through the building of a series of 8 locks. Eight locks have already been built. This would permit the deep draft, 27-foot ships to go the full length to the ocean.

Canada has already built the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Erie and Lake Ontario at the expense of 133 million dollars.

We are, as my associates know, a growing Nation of 145 million people today. A decade or more from now we will be 160 million or more, and we will need, as suggested by Senator Aiken, all the additional facilities in transportation and in electric power that we can develop.

Do we have faith in America, or do we have fear for America? That is the question.

But, why, specifically, should we support the Seaway? Well, here's why:

1. For national defense, because it is a great alternative sea

route, which would ease the railroad bottleneck and provide ship-building and ship repair facilities in the interior.

2. For sustainment of a vital segment of our economy—50 million people of the Middle West.

3. To preserve our steel industry at its present location rather than to have it move because of the exhaustion of the Mesabi iron range. And if it does have to move, you can figure the cost.

4. To meet the present power shortage, as outlined by Senator Aiken.

5. To set a precedent for great wealth-producing projects, particularly in times of slack, built at no cost to Uncle Sam.

6. To confirm anew our historic alliance and friendship with Canada. The news today indicates clearly we need to tie to one another.

7. To reduce transportation costs of agricultural and other commodities, thus saving the consumer money and aiding in overseas commerce.

8. To utilize the magnificent natural resource which would prove indispensable in a national emergency.

Time does not permit me to elaborate on each of these points. I ask you all to bear these facts in mind, my friends. The Seaway Resolution is constitutional. The present resolution merely implements the Treaty of 1909, already ratified.

The Seaway and the power project, although they will cost 720 million dollars to the United States and Canada, will not cost the people or the taxpayers a cent. Tolls and charges for the electricity will pay the complete cost of the Seaway. On the other hand, we have spent a billion dollars each in Tennessee and the Mississippi Valley.

The Seaway which is supported by every public opinion poll is endorsed, too, by leading authorities by every American President since Harding, and by every Secretary of State since that time. Why then do we falter when the joint Chiefs of Staff support it and the Permanent Joint Board of Defense of the United States and Canada support it?

Why then do we delay after a quarter of a century of debate and mountains of favorable reports?

Why then do we allow fear to overwhelm us?

Remember all that is being asked is a loan of money to build the Seaway which will be paid for by tolls—a loan to our own people. It is not like the Marshall Plan which contemplates, among other things, the building of power plants and the improvement of water transportation in Europe. My friends, charity and vision begin at home. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Wiley. Call the next speaker, after graduation.

from Harvard, tried his hand in the newspaper field as a member of the staffs of the *Boston Evening Transcript* and the *New York Herald Tribune* but could not resist the family tradition when called to public service. He is, of course, the grandson of the late Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and in 1936 and 1942 he was elected to the United States Senate. However, in February, 1944, he resigned from the Senate to go into active combat duty in the Army. His distinguished military career won for him many military awards. In 1946 he was re-elected to the Senate where he now serves as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., speaking from Washington. (*Applause.*)

Senator Lodge:

Senator Wiley infers that the opposition to the Seaway is sectional and confined to the eastern ports. Let's analyze that statement and see the states from which Senators come who have announced against the proposal. They start at the northeast corner of the country in Maine and run clear across Texas and Oklahoma. They run from the southeast corner in Georgia way out to Nebraska and Nevada in the western corner. They even include Great Lakes States like Ohio. Quite a big section, Senator Wiley. If this is sectionalism, make the most of it.

I say to Senator Aiken that I

warmly appreciate the vital need for power but the Seaway Proposal does not assure power to those who need it the most. Moreover, a man who wants a room with a southern exposure does not need to build a skyscraper in order to get it. You can have the power without building the Seaway.

Then I am sincerely sorry that Senator Aiken should say that the opponents are, "prompted wholly by blind, self-interest." I always think that when someone impugns his opponent's motives, it shows that his own argument is pretty weak. Rest assured that I shall not impugn anyone's motives, but I shall seek to destroy their arguments. I shall do so by admitting frankly at the outset that the idea of the St. Lawrence Seaway which in truth pays for itself, which is big enough and deep enough to handle ocean traffic, and which is presented without circumventing the Senate's treaty-making powers is a very appealing one. But the unhappy truth is that the St. Lawrence project as now presented to us would not pay for itself, would not accommodate the great bulk of American commercial tonnage and is presented to the Senate in a manner which circumvents the essential spirit of our Constitution.

The plain facts are that the cost of the Seaway; the capacity of the Seaway, if built; the tolls to be levied on shipping; the method by which the annual charges are to

be liquidated by tolls are all in dispute.

The cost of deepening the Great Lakes harbors and access channels is not even in dispute—it is unknown. The way in which the tolls are to be collected and divided between Canada and United States, and the type of cargo on which tolls will be levied are all unknown.

The use of the Seaway, if built, is, therefore, incomplete and in utter dispute. These are the disputes on the basic engineering and economic facts which persist after 20 years of discussion. Letters were sent to 32 of America's leading shipping lines. One replied that its lines would use the Seaway, one was noncommittal, and 30 stated emphatically that they would not use it if built because of navigation dangers, shallowness of the channel, greater time involved, and the fact that there are no ships constructed for both lake and ocean use.

Would you build such a seaway? Would you build a Seaway which will be frozen up tighter than a drum for five months of the year, so much so that many people refer to it as the St. Lawrence iceway?

Would you build a seaway, which, according to the figures submitted by the Maritime Commission is so shallow that 90 per cent of all American shipping tonnages would not be able to use it?

Would you build a seaway, the terminal ports of which are too

shallow to accommodate the vessels for which it is designed?

I have asked these questions of the supporters of this project but have received no satisfactory answers. The Seaway which is frozen up 40 per cent of the year and which would constitute a drain on our already massively depleted military manpower resources is not a military asset.

Note please that the joint chiefs of staff decided that the Panama Canal—that was just a few days ago—in the light of the needs of future war, must be made into a sea-level canal as soon as possible. Actions speak louder than words.

Senator Wiley reads a list of "big shots" in support of his proposal. But he doesn't tell you that one of them, Herbert Hoover, says that the channel should be 30 feet deep instead of 27 feet. He doesn't tell you that his military advocates choose their words so carefully that they actually damn with faint praise, and that not one of them says that the Seaway is as important to the national defense as a 70-group air force, for example, or a stockpile of vital raw materials or a solution to our critical military manpower shortage or the development of an over-military strategic plan.

My friends, if we have a billion dollars to throw around, common sense tells you that these are the things which come first, and that as the Secretary of the Army says

the Seaway is emphatically, "not vital to the national defense."

We can all appreciate the value of seaways in principle—I know that I do—and still question whether this is the time to add another billion to the many billions that we must spend for European recovery. We can believe in useful public works, as I do, and still realize that, as presented, the Seaway is such a colossal, impracticality, that this could be of no benefit to any state, and would, in fact, be a waste of money and source of trouble to the whole country.

The constructive thing to do is to appropriate enough funds for a study by competent professionals, such as the Army Engineers, and at last clear up the fatal and damaging doubt which has shrouded this project for the last 20 years.

Yes, Senator Wiley, it is just because I have faith in America that I believe she will continue to build great public works, but that she will never embark on the half-baked boondoggle which you present to us tonight. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Lodge and gentlemen, for your very clear presentation of both sides of this question. In just a few moments we're going to have our discussion up here around the microphone. Now while we get ready for our discussion period, I'm sure that

you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: You are listening to the Nation's most popular radio forum, "America's Town Meeting of the Air," originating in the Second Congregational Church in Waterbury, Connecticut. We are discussing the question, "Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?" You won't want to miss the printed copy of this entire broadcast, including questions and answers to follow, which is published for your convenience in our Town Meeting Bulletin. You may secure it by sending 10c to Town Hall, New York 18, New York, to cover the cost of printing and mailing. You may secure eleven issues for \$1.00 or 26 issues for \$2.35; or for a year for \$4.50.

Are you getting the most out of your Town Meeting broadcasts? Each week more listeners are writing in to tell us how they are listening to Town Meeting in homes, groups, churches, and schools.

From East Greenbush, New York, a young listener writes, "Our high school is organizing a Junior Town Meeting of the Air program which will be produced before our student assembly of approximately 600 members on March 12. We understand that your organization extends aid and advice to Junior Town Meeting groups. If this is the case, then we would be most appreciative of

any assistance you might be willing to give us. We hope to hear from you in the very near future."

More than 5,000 high school students, teachers, and station managers are members of the Junior Town Meeting League. If you want to organize a Junior Town Meeting write to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Now, we return you to Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Now, gentlemen,

before we take our questions from this fine Waterbury audience, let's have our discussion around the microphone. The speakers down in Washington will come in just as readily as if they were right here. Let's start with Senator Aiken.

Senator Aiken: Inasmuch as neither one of our opponents made any points against the Seaway which can be proved or which are tenable, but inasmuch as Senator

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HUGH ALLEN MEADE—Born in Netcong, New Jersey, in 1907, Congressman Meade is a graduate of Loyola High School, Baltimore; Loyola College, and the University of Maryland Law School, where he received his degree in 1932. He started his political career almost immediately as secretary to Governor Albert C. Ritchie. In 1934 he was elected to the Maryland State Legislature and in 1936 was appointed Supervisor of Assessments of Baltimore City. In 1938, he was appointed assistant attorney-general of Maryland in charge of legislative work.

During World War II, Congressman Meade served in the U.S. Navy. In 1946, he resigned from attorney-general's office to enter private law and to campaign for his election to Congress in November, 1946. A Democrat, Congressman Meade is a member of the House Merchant Marine & Fisheries Committee.

ALEXANDER WILEY—A Republican from Wisconsin, Senator Wiley, is the author of the recent humorous book, *Laughing With Congress*. Born in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin, in 1884, he attended Augsburg College in Minneapolis, the University of Michigan Law School, and received a degree in law from the University of Wisconsin. Entering the practice of law in Chippewa Falls, he also operated a dairy farm, became a director of a bank, served on the local school board, and was active in local business and civic affairs.

From 1909 to 1915, he was district attorney for Chippewa County, and in November, 1938, was elected to the U. S. Senate. He was re-elected in 1944 for the current term. Senator Wiley is Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the

Senate. He writes a weekly column of Washington news which he sends to many Wisconsin weekly newspapers.

HENRY CABOT LODGE—Born in Nahant, Mass., Mr. Lodge follows the Senatorial footsteps of his grandfather whose name he also bears. Educated in Harvard, he worked as Washington correspondent, foreign correspondent, and editorial writer on the *Boston Evening Transcript* and the *New York Herald-Tribune* before his election to the Massachusetts General Court in 1933. He served two terms and then was elected to the U.S. Senate. He was reelected in 1942 but resigned in 1944 to go on active combat duty with the U.S. Army. He was the first U.S. Senator to see action with the American Armed Forces since the Civil War. Elected once more to the Senate in November, 1946, Mr. Lodge is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Lodge has traveled widely.

GEORGE DAVID AIKEN—Republican, from Vermont, Senator Aiken was born in Dummerston, Vermont, in 1892. He was educated in the common schools of Putney, Vermont, and was graduated from Brattleboro High School. He has received honorary degrees from Norwich University and from the University of Vermont.

By occupation a farmer, he was elected town representative in 1931, and was speaker of the House of Representatives in 1933. He was lieutenant-governor of Vermont and then governor for two terms. Senator Aiken was elected to the United States Senate in November, 1940, to fill the vacancy for the term ending January, 1945. He was re-elected in November, 1944.

Lodge made the most errors, I wish to direct two or three questions to him. Is it not true, Senator Lodge, that the army engineers have completed a plan for the Seaway so that it could start tomorrow morning?

And did they not estimate its total cost to be \$719,000,000, of which \$320,000,000 would be paid for by the electric energy?

It is not true that the Department of Commerce completed a study of the probable navigation of the Seaway, and estimated that the tolls on oil, coal, grain, and ore, alone, would pay for the navigation end of the Seaway?

Is it not true that the Maritime Commission estimated that 80 per cent of the entire Merchant Marine of the United States could use the Seaway?

Is it not true that the joint Chiefs of Staff urged the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway to enhance our national security?

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Aiken. Senator Lodge, I think the Senator expects a one-word answer for that. Senator Lodge in Washington.

Senator Lodge: Well, Senator Aiken asked me five questions, but I've only got one mouth so I'll have to try to answer them one at a time. The first answer is that, of course, there has been no thorough, professional, impartial study of the economics of this proposition, in which a year was taken to put out questionnaires, to

get the evidence, and really get to the bottom of the engineering and economic features. The Secretary of Commerce has said on the stand that his estimates are very rough. I think I'm quoting that direct.

The Maritime Commission's own figures—the ones which Senator Wiley and Senator Aiken used, and which are in the Congressional Record—show that only 91 per cent of American shipping tonnages could use the Seaway if they are fully loaded. Of course, if the ships are not fully loaded, then I suppose you could inch the Queen Elizabeth through it, if you took plenty of time and it didn't have anything in it, but that, of course, is not a practical way to operate.

Now insofar as the joint Chiefs of Staff are concerned, of course, they are soldiers—they probably do what they are told—but you can judge better by their actions than by their words, and the actions which took just a few weeks ago were to recommend to the public that the Panama Canal should be made a sea-level canal as soon as possible, in order that it be able to meet the challenge of the war of the future. The joint Chiefs of Staff have never said, and I warrant you that they never will say, that in the face of a threat of war, the thing to do is to build the St. Lawrence Seaway rather than to build up your air force and stockpiles of vital raw materials.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you, Senator. Now here's Congressman Meade here. Do you want to fire some questions?

Congressman Meade: Yes, Mr. Denny. I'd like to direct my first question to Senator Wiley. Incidentally, in his opening statement, he referred to this project as an engineer's dream. I think if he'd used the term "nightmare" he would have been, perhaps, more correct. The question that I want to ask Senator Wiley is this: he says that this will not cost the people of the United States a cent. It's going to be self-liquidating. Will he please tell me how, based on his own estimates of the amount of tonnage that can possibly be carried over the Seaway, with the ceiling price on the amount of tolls that can be charged, how this will be self-liquidating if, on his own estimates, it will cost approximately three quarters of a billion dollars? The actual cost of maintenance per year would be around twenty million dollars. The interest on the investment alone would be around fifteen million dollars. There would be no allowance for amortization, no allowance for the tremendous number of people that would be required to keep this colossus in operation. So with a total of about thirty-five to forty million dollars a year outlay by the American people—how are you going to get that back in tolls?

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Wiley, you and Senator Lodge notice that when these speakers fire their guns, they fire all six shots at once. All right. Senator Wiley

Senator Wiley: Mr. Denny, I like to say this first about the statement which my colleague Senator Lodge made. He's been baying—he bayed, you remember being from the Bay State—about eight different matters. Let me call attention to this fact. All of the points which he says are in dispute—now I say this, and then I'll come to Senator Meade's question—have been actually substantiated by literally a mountain of testimony from the greatest engineers—and it's not disputed in the record—economists and public officials for the last twenty years. My dear friend from the Bay State might just as well contend that the United States Constitution is in dispute or that the Holy Bible is in dispute.

Now in relation to what Congressman Meade said, apparently he, too, hasn't read the record because, the figures are all in there by the Army Engineers. They are also in there, not as Senator Lodge said, simply an uncertain statement by the Secretary of Commerce, Wiley testified—he said that he was having the matter checked, and in November, the Commerce Department came through with a complete report demonstrating conclusively, and there is no real testimony to the

contrary, that the building of these locks, opening up this 100-mile stretch would be economical, would be practical, and would be in the interest of the national interests.

Now, if you want the exact figure, you have \$720,000,000 with the total Canadian cost \$230,000,000, leaving the actual cost of the Seaway \$490,000,000. If you deduct the power cost to the United States, that leaves \$161,000,000, or a total Seaway cost of \$329,000,000.

Now, you and I know that out of the Great Lakes between 400 and 500 million bushels wheat will pour through. You and I know that at five cents, which has been estimated, that 500 million would save \$25,000,000 to the farmers and the toll on the wheat would amount to millions. Outside of that the record clearly shows, as laid down, that there would be toll on ore, toll on grain, toll on coal, and the balance, and there would be revenue of from \$20,000,000 to \$27,000,000.

Now, these are not my figures. Congressman Meade asked for my figures. I'm not giving you my figures. I'm giving you what the record says. I'm also saying that the idea you can argue away the support of men like the Presidents of the United States since Harding, that you can argue away the support of George C. Marshall, and the joint Chief of Staff, and the Permanent Board of Defense

of the United States and Canada by simply saying that their testimony doesn't amount to anything, doesn't carry any weight, I'm sure, with the listeners.

Mr. Denny: I thank you, Senator Wiley. Senator Meade wants to get in on this—I mean Congressman Meade. I knew somebody would make him a Senator tonight, but I didn't think I'd be the one. (*Laughter.*)

Congressman Meade: Thank you, for the promotion, Mr. Denny. Senator Wiley, you know, as I know, that there are probably as many estimates of the cost of this project as there are people who give the estimates. But I wonder if you also know that it was estimated that the cost of the Panama Canal would be \$160,000,000 and when we ended up, it cost us \$375,000,000? And it was estimated that the Suez Canal would cost \$30,000,000, and when that was finished, it cost \$80,000,000. How far wrong do you think these estimates are?

Senator Wiley: My answer to that is that the estimate of the Army Engineers of the Panama Canal was five million more than it actually cost to produce and that's what the records show.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Wiley. We haven't heard from Senator Lodge down there. How about Senator Lodge, have you a question, Senator?

Senator Lodge: I would just like to ask my friends who are support-

ing this idea why they just won't be candid with themselves and with the American people and agree with all of us that a Seaway is a fine thing in principle but that this thing is set up all wrong, that none of the figures add up, that the thing doesn't make sense, that former President Hoover, who came out for the thing in principle, says the channel should be 30 feet deep. Why don't they face these things frankly and say, "Yes, we ought to do what General Wheeler says we ought to do"?

Who's General Wheeler? He's the chief of the Army Engineers, and General Wheeler says that no real, full, thorough-going study has ever been made of these economic and engineering factors and it would take at least a year to do it.

Now I just ask the proponents why, instead of barking up the wrong tree all the time, and presenting us with a project which is a colossal impracticality, why don't they admit that there are these errors and go off and get these errors corrected and come back with a proposition which really holds water, which really makes

sense? That seems to me like the manly, intelligent thing to do.

Senator Wiley: Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Yes, you. Senator Wiley.

Senator Wiley: I'd like to answer that. I'd like to ask Senator Lodge to show the page in the record where that statement occurred. What General Wheeler said was that he was never asked to make the economic survey — that his business was to make the engineering survey. He made the engineering survey and he gave us the figures. The Department of Commerce was asked five years ago to make the economic survey, and they completed it in November, 1917, and that is now before the Congress showing what the actual economics of the situation are.

Now it's no argument as my dear friend here has already indicated, to say "Why don't you do so and so?" Their argument reminds me of the dear woman who saw the regiment go down the street and her boy was out of step and she said, "Everybody out of step but my boy."

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you, gentlemen.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now let's get some questions from this representative Waterbury audience here. Here's a lady down here with a question for Senator Aiken.

Lady: I'd like to direct my question to Senator Aiken. Being a New Englander, I'd like to know how will Boston and New York, as shipping centers, be affected

this new waterway as far as industry is concerned? Will it move industry to the midwest?

Senator Aiken: Boston would probably gain in tonnage from the development of the waterway by reason of having an all-water route to the midwest. I know that the opponents of this project say that Boston would lose export business. Boston couldn't lose export business. It only exports about 400,000 tons a year at the present time, which is far less than several of the Great Lakes ports export and they only have a 14-foot canal through which to ship their goods at the present time.

New York could not lose business because the Port of New York can't handle the business it's got now and they are trying to develop \$114,000,000 additional facilities for the Port of New York to meet the demands that are being made upon it. We need this alternate route for shipments abroad. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the gentleman on the aisle over here.

Man: Congressman Meade. TVA includes no interest on the government bonds in its cost. Would the St. Lawrence project be run similarly and so not be truly self-liquidating?

Congressman Meade: Definitely there's no question in my mind whatsoever, and I see no reason, of course, to disagree with Senator Aiken as to why there shouldn't be

a power project for New England. But I do think that if it is constructed, it shouldn't be the railroad worker, the shipyard worker, and the people of the other sections of the country who pay for it. Let the people who use the power pay for it.

Mr. Denny: I think Senator Aiken has something to say to that.

Senator Aiken: May I say that while the TVA has not made interest to date, yet it has returned a good many million dollars to the United States Treasury, and could pay interest because it is well managed and is making a profit every year from its electrical operations. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Is there a question in the balcony?

Man: My question is directed to Senator Wiley. With the threat of atomic warfare, would not funds be spent wiser right now on atomic research than on a project so vulnerable to atomic attack?

Senator Wiley: I think that's a very good question. I agree fully with you that at present we haven't the antidote to the atomic bomb, but neither is Boston, or New York, or any city free from attack. We know that after what happened in Hiroshima what would happen anyplace. But there is this to be said, that from our experience in France and Germany, we know that the thing needed in this country is more and more channels to be opened. That's what

Secretary Marshall, that's what Secretary Royall, and that's what all the folks feel is necessary. Of course, defense isn't simply when war begins. Defense starts way back when you're creating the economic health of a country and building up your industries so that you can meet the impact on a thousand fronts. That's why this thing is so important from a defense angle.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Wiley. Now, another question here?

Man: My question is addressed to Senator Lodge. If you could rewrite the bill to provide it with a self-liquidating project and sound business investment, would you present it to Congress?

Senator Lodge: That's a very good question. If this bill was truly self-liquidating, if the engineering features were workable, and if it was not circumventing the Constitution, I'd vote for it like a shot. I certainly would. Let me ask Senator Wiley this question, while I've got the mike in front of me here. Senator Wiley, do you think it more important to build up air force in these dangerous days than it is to build the St. Lawrence Seaway? I'd like to know which you think is the most important for the national defense.

Senator Wiley: I don't think you have to answer that question at this time for the simple reason that we're figuring that you've

got seven billion dollars surplus this year. You're figuring that you're going to throw five billion of them at Europe. You're figuring also that it would be five years before you would commence to spend anything for this improvement. All the passage of this resolution would do would be to authorize the President to consummate the agreement and get under way the preliminary steps so that you wouldn't have any WPA propositions on your hands when the depression comes, but would have a worthwhile proposition to go into.

Mr. Denny: All right. Senator Aiken wants to get in on this. Yes?

Senator Aiken: I'd like to know where Senator Lodge is going to get the aluminum necessary for his invincible air force with the aluminum plants, both in the TVA area in the St. Lawrence Valley, curtailing their production right now for a shortage of power. (Applause.)

Senator Lodge: That's a very good question. I think we can get some more aluminum out of this country, and I'm expecting we're going to get a great deal of aluminum back under the Marshall Plan. We've got a provision in that bill now which provides for receiving strategic raw materials by barter in exchange for our aid. It is my hope that we will get a lot of raw materials out of that.

I'm glad Senator Aiken asked that question because it points

the fact that the most urgent thing that we've got to do is to get our air force built up and get our strategic raw materials piled up, and that not a single military expert has ever even inferred that the St. Lawrence iceway should have a higher priority than those projects. Even the Senator from Wisconsin, who is so far ahead of his time in preparedness, contradicts himself because in one speech that he makes on national defense, he comes out rightly for a strong air force and then he turns around and says that this ought to have priority.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Lodge. Here's Senator Aiken again.

Senator Aiken: Senator Lodge has a wonderful plan for maintaining our air force with aluminum from overseas. I think we had better produce that aluminum right in America.

Senator Lodge: Well, we can do both.

Senator Aiken: I want to say I'm glad to see that Senator Lodge has hope that he's going to get something back from Europe. I think he should have a little more hope and faith in God's country, the United States of America.

Senator Lodge: Well, I wouldn't vote for anything for Europe if I didn't think we were going to get something out of it.

Mr. Denny: Thank you gentlemen, thank you. Now here's an-

other question. Over here on the right.

Man: This question is for Senator Wiley. This project is one more step toward socialism. How much more can we go? Do we want socialism or free enterprise?

Senator Wiley: Well, I'm sure that you don't understand the real basis of this self-liquidating scheme if you call this socialism. You know that down in the TVA the Government loaned the Tennessee Valley proposition about a billion dollars but there's been no return to speak of. But this contemplates self-liquidation and it's on a business basis and doesn't contemplate injuring private interests.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now, here's a telephone call that came in from Grand Rapids, Michigan, Senator Lodge. A great many telegrams have come in and it isn't possible to take them all. Here's one for you. If it isn't feasible for an ocean-going freighter to go through the Seaway, how can you explain the fact that *Gotha*"—that's apparently the name of a boat — "a Swedish freighter, docked at Grand Haven, Michigan, with a load of wood pulp from Sweden and returned to Sweden?"

Senator Lodge: I think, of course, it is possible for small ocean-going vessels to get in and I've always said that, that some nine per cent of American ton-nages can use the Seaway. What I say is that it would be more help-

ful to those good people out in the Great Lakes States if the Seaway were made a little deeper so that all of the ships could use it. In fact, I think that the reason why some of the Senators from the Great Lakes States are opposed to this project is because they feel it would only take the very small ocean-going vessels.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Here's a question from a very young listener here in the audience.

Young Man: Why couldn't ice-breakers break the ice during the five months that ice is on it?

Mr. Denny: That is for you, Congressman Meade.

Congressman Meade: That's a very good question, but it has been tried before without success. They can't get the ice-breakers large enough, the cost is simply tremendous in trying to do it and would just add one more insurmountable object to this St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Aiken has a comment on it.

Senator Aiken: May I point out that during the 240 days average season on the Great Lakes the ports on the Great Lakes now handle two-thirds as much shipping as all the ports on the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific Coast combined.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Aiken. Now while our speakers prepare their summaries of to-

night's question, here's a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: At the end of Town Meeting broadcast have you ever asked yourself, "What can I do?" In a brief 12-point program Mr. Denny has offered some answers to this question. Here is what he says in Point 9 of his booklet called, *What Can I Do?*

"You can and should have faith in your own convictions. Our way of life is based upon our faith in the supreme worth of the individual. This is not to say each individual is infallible as we are all conditioned by both heredity and environment, but our inner convictions come from our ability to choose between good and evil, right and wrong, justice and injustice. Our ideas about these things may vary, but our inner convictions represent the highest and noblest development of our individual characters. We must not be swayed by rationalized expediency against the best judgment of our conscience."

If you would like a copy of this pamphlet, *What Can I Do?* send ten cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Now we return to Mr. Denny for the discussion summaries.

Mr. Denny: Now, Congressman Meade, may we have your summary on tonight's discussion "Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?"

Congressman Meade: Mr. Denny, in summing up the arguments of Senator Lodge and myself, we would like to point out that the passage of this billion-dollar boondoggle piece of legislation at this time would be unwise, unsound, and unconstitutional. The project would in no way be self-liquidating. It would not be of any value as a defense measure. It would be frozen up five months of the year. American shipping lines would not use and couldn't use it because 90 per cent of American ships couldn't navigate a 27-foot channel. It would upset the whole transportation system of our country and would put thousands of railroad and shipyard workers out of a job.

Last, but not least, it is purely a power project which some people would like to have charged off as a seaway. Senator Lodge and I believe we have presented many sound arguments against this legislation, and I have yet to hear a really good argument in favor of it. Thank you.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Congressman Meade and now may we have a final word from Senator Aiken.

Senator Aiken: In summarizing for the proponents, I should like to stress the following basic facts. There is no question about the need for additional transportation and power facilities in this country if we are to have an expanding

economy. The opposition has based its case on technicalities ranging from the constitutional issue to channel fog.

The opposition is centered in the power companies, the railroads, and the port cities of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. All of these groups have selfish reasons for opposing this project. The question boils down to this, "Should these utility interests be operated for the benefit of our economy or should our whole economy be fitted around the desires of the power companies, railroads, and certain port cities?"

The proponents in their argument support a philosophy of progress and growth, the opponents espouse a philosophy of the status quo which favors entrenched self-interests. No other country in the world, if they had our wealth, would hesitate for a moment to develop this greatest undeveloped resource on the North American Continent. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Aiken, Congressman Meade, Senator Wiley, and Senator Lodge. Our thanks also to our host the Reverend John C. Walker and his associates in the Second Congregational Church Forum and station WATR, affiliated with our network.

Remember, ladies and gentlemen, the United States Senate votes on the question of the St. Lawrence

Seaway next Friday, so if you, the citizens of America, have aught to say, say it now.

If you want a copy of this discussion, you may obtain it by sending 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week we return to Town Hall, New York, for a most unusual but very important program. Do you happen to read "Li'l Abner," "Dick Tracy," or "Terry and the Pirates?" Or are your youngsters avid readers of comic books? Whatever your answers to these questions, you are sure

to have strong opinions about next week's program, when Al Capp, creator of "Li'l Abner," and George Hecht, president and publisher of *Parent's Magazine*, lock horns with John Mason Brown, associate editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature* and Town Hall lecturer, and Marya Mannes, foreign correspondent and author of *Messengers from a Stranger*, on the subject "What's Wrong with the Comics." So plan to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the crier's bell. (Applause.)